



King's Research Portal

DOI:

[10.1136/oemed-2019-105726](https://doi.org/10.1136/oemed-2019-105726)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Stratton, E., Choi, I., A Calvo, R., Hickie, I., Henderson, C., Harvey, S. B., & Glozier, N. (2019). Web-based decision aid tool for disclosure of a mental health condition in the workplace: a randomised controlled trial. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 76(9), 595-602. <https://doi.org/10.1136/oemed-2019-105726>

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

A WEB-BASED DECISION AID TOOL FOR DISCLOSURE OF A MENTAL HEALTH CONDITION IN THE WORKPLACE: A RANDOMISED CONTROLLED TRIAL

Elizabeth Stratton*^{1, 2}, Isabella Choi^{1, 2}, Rafael A Calvo⁶, Ian Hickie¹, Claire Henderson⁷, Samuel
B Harvey^{3,4,5}, Nicholas Glozier^{1, 2}

¹*Brain and Mind Centre, Sydney Medical School, University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia*

²*School of Psychiatry, University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia*

³*School of Psychiatry, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia*

⁴*Black Dog Institute, Sydney, Australia*

⁵*St George Hospital, Sydney, Australia*

⁶*School of Electrical and Information Engineering, University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia*

⁷*Health Service and Population Research Department, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology &
Neuroscience, King's College London, London, United Kingdom*

*corresponding author: eodg5192@uni.sydney.edu.au

ABSTRACT

Objectives

Making decisions about disclosing a mental illness in the workplace is complicated. Decision aid tools are designed to help an individual make a specific choice. We developed a web-based decision aid (READY) to help inform decisions about disclosure for employees. This study aimed to examine the efficacy of this tool.

Method

We conducted an RCT with recruitment, randomisation and data collection all online. Participants had access to the intervention for two weeks. Assessments occurred at baseline, post-intervention, and six weeks follow up. The primary outcome was decisional conflict. Secondary outcomes were stage and satisfaction of decision-making and mental health symptoms.

Results

107 adult employees were randomised to READY (n=53) or the control (n=54). The sample was predominantly female (83.2%). Participants using READY showed greater reduction in decisional conflict at post-intervention ($F(1,104) = 16.8, p = <.001$) ($d=0.49, CI=0.1-0.9$), and

follow-up ($F(1,104) = 23.6, p = <.001$) ($d=0.61, CI=0.1-0.9$). At post-intervention the READY group were at a later stage of decision making ($F(1,104) = 6.9, p=0.010$) which was sustained, and showed a greater reduction in depressive symptoms ($F(1,104) = 6.5, p=0.013$). 28% of READY users disclosed, and reported a greater improvement in mental health than those who did not disclose.

Conclusions

READY provides a confidential, flexible, effective tool to enhance employee's decision making about disclosure. Its use led to a comparative improvement in depressive symptoms compared to the current information provided by a leading mental health NGO, without apparent harm. READY seems worth evaluating in other settings and, if these results are replicated, scaling for wider use.

Trial registration number

(ANZCTR): ACTRN12618000229279.

Key Messages

1. What is already known about this subject?
 - Deciding whether or not to disclose a mental illness in the workplace is often complicated, with different considerations for each individual.
 - Often individuals need to disclose their mental illness to receive reasonable adjustments.
 - Decision aid tools are designed to help individuals make a specific and deliberate choice and are widely used to inform decisions about medical treatment options.
2. What are the new findings?
 - This trial demonstrated that READY, the first online disclosure decision aid tool for employees, reduced decisional conflict regarding disclosure of a mental illness compared to the provision of standard information about disclosure and its consequence
 - Use of the program resulted in people being at a later stage of decision making, being more satisfied with their decision and less depressed at follow up, with no indication of psychological harm.
3. How might this impact on policy or clinical practice in the foreseeable future?
 - READY provides a confidential, flexible, effective online tool to enable employees to make an informed decision about which disclosure option is best for them.
 - The decision aid allows individuals to consider an active disclosure before an event occurs, allowing employees to take control of their decision-making.

INTRODUCTION

Deciding whether or not to disclose a mental illness in the workplace is often complicated, with individualised considerations [1]. Within the workplace context, disclosure is defined as the process in which an employee informs their employer of their disability [2]. Under many countries' equalities legislation, individuals need to disclose to receive reasonable adjustments [3].

Interpersonal factors such as discrimination and stigma can affect employee's disclosure decision-making [4]. Employers prefer potential employees make disclosures during recruitment [5] despite consistent evidence showing that employees may be seen as less employable [6]. As a result, employees fear discrimination [7], worry about being a burden on others, being seen as weak [8], or not being hired or promoted [9]. A recent Australian survey found that over half of those who had experienced discrimination report not being hired because of their mental illness [10], and a global survey showed that employees were reluctant to disclose out of fear of job loss [11]. Employees who had disclosed reported limited knowledge of symptoms, stigma and discrimination, limited managerial support, and perceived negative consequences were barriers to their disclosure [12].

The literature on disclosing mental health conditions in the workplace has often focussed on the outcomes or predictors [13], rather than the process. Whether to disclose at all, how much to disclose (partial or full), and whom to disclose to, draws on three identified styles of selective, indiscriminant, or broadcasting disclosure [14]. The timing is important as concealment itself can be a major stressor [15], and sometimes, a forced decision may be precipitated by symptom severity or impairment [6]. A recent study [16] indicated that employees generally start from a position of non-disclosure, often only moving to a position of disclosure when symptoms are no longer concealable.

Decision aid tools are designed to help individuals make a specific and deliberate choice, and are widely used to facilitate decisions about medical treatment options. A systematic review showed that decision aids for people facing treatment or screening decisions produced less decisional conflict, higher knowledge, a more active role in decision-making, and increased risk perception [17]. In the mental health context, the CORAL RCT [18] showed a paper-

based decision aid tool for people with a severe mental illness in secondary care services reduced disclosure decisional conflict when seeking employment and tangible employment benefits.

We developed a web-based decision aid tool (READY) to help facilitate disclosure decisions for individuals in current employment. This study aimed to examine the efficacy of READY in reducing decisional conflict, the primary outcome, compared to the online disclosure information provided by a leading mental health charity, at post-intervention and six weeks follow up. Secondary outcomes were the effect on the stage and satisfaction of decision-making and mental health.

METHODS

Design

A parallel arm randomised controlled trial (RCT) was conducted. Participants had open access to READY or online disclosure information for two weeks. Assessments occurred at baseline, post-intervention, and six weeks post-baseline.

Recruitment, randomisation, and data collection were all internet-based.

Participants

The target population was employed adults, any gender, aged 18 to 65 years, with a self-identified mental health condition, who had not previously disclosed mental ill-health to their current employer.

Participants were excluded if they did not have access to reliable Internet, a valid email address, or if they reported poor English fluency.

This study was approved by the University of Sydney Ethics Review Board: 2017/740, and registered in the Australian New Zealand Clinical Trials Registry (ANZCTR): ACTRN12618000229279.

Recruitment, Informed Consent and Randomisation

Recruitment occurred between 8th November 2017 and 25th February 2018 through many channels: emails to people on a mental health research register, a pop up in a mental health treatment App (HeadGear), and via Facebook advertisements. These invited people to visit the study website.

The website provided an online version of the participant information statement and consent form, which was available for download. After completing the informed consent process online, participants completed the baseline questionnaires (socio-demographic, outcome and moderator measures) on the study website before being randomised. Automatic computerised randomisation was triggered within the website when eligible participants completed the baseline assessment. The allocation was set at a 1 to 1 ratio, and the procedure allowed for full replication.

Intervention

The content of READY was developed in an iterative fashion based upon currently available disclosure materials [18] and guided by an international expert group. The content of READY was tested in focus groups with employees who had disclosed mental ill-health in the workplace and key occupational decision makers [12] to identify influencing factors. The wording of the tool scored a Flesch-Kincaid Grade level of 6.6, which is understandable by the average 11 year old [19].

The final program (READY) was based around seven self-guided modules which enabled the user to consider potential consequences of (non)disclosure, weighing advantages and obstacles, their needs and values, timing and process of disclosing while reflecting on past disclosures, and providing the user with an interactive summary their responses. Each module was designed to take approximately five to ten minutes to complete. The program was carefully worded to avoid promoting any specific decision as the “correct” one. Users needed to complete each interactive module to be able to move to the next module. Multiple logins were available.

Control condition

The control group were given access to a visually similar website with four modules that contained information about disclosure rights and responsibilities, laws, and legislation based on content from the HeadsUp website, an Australian website aimed at workers with mental health conditions, hosted by the country's largest mental health NGO, beyondblue. This website has been publicly available since 2014, and a recent international review of guidelines that manage workplace mental health conditions highly rated the website for quality and comprehension [20], and it was awarded the Best Online Learning and Education Resource at the Digital Industry Association of Australia Awards 2014 with 146,000 unique views within the first year [21]. Permission was obtained to use the content from the HeadsUp website. Users again had to complete each module to be able to move to the next.

Both conditions provided links to the relevant legislation: Disability and Discrimination Act 1992, and the Privacy Act 1988.

Program procedures

Following allocation, the program (READY or Control) was available to the participant for two weeks. If no login took place within four days of randomisation, an automated reminder email was sent, followed by a phone call two days later by the lead researcher. Participants received the post-intervention questions when they finished their final module, or at two weeks after allocation. They completed the online follow-up questionnaires four weeks later. Participants who did not complete online follow up and had provided contact details were called once by the lead researcher to complete these over the phone.

Measures

Socio-demographic measures

Participants self-reported demographic information: gender, age, relationship status, and indigenous background.

Study-specific questions measured the participant's workplace relationships such as, "*Do you feel you have a good relationship with your boss*" with dichotomous "Yes or No" answers.

Workplace sector was assessed by asking participants to select from 15 options. Participants self-reported diagnosed mental health conditions with multiple options provided and a

provision of a free text box. We classified schizophrenia and bipolar as “severe mental disorder” and all others as “common mental disorder”.

Primary Outcome Measure

The primary outcome was change in decisional conflict post-intervention. Decisional conflict was measured using the 10-item Decisional Conflict Scale Low Literacy version (DCS) [22] ($\alpha=.86$), measuring self-reported uncertainty, the level that they feel informed, clarity of values, whether they feel supported and effective decision-making. Participants responded: Yes = 0, Unsure = 2, and No = 4 on a Likert scale to each question, the scores were summed and transformed into a 0-100 scale as per the user manual, (no decisional conflict =0, extremely high decisional conflict =100).

Secondary Outcome Measures

Stage of Decision Making (SDM), a five-question scale to measure individual readiness to engage in decision making [23]. Participants selected their stage of decision making from “I have not yet thought about the options” = 0 to “I have already told my employer” = 5.

Decisional dissatisfaction was measured with two items stating “do you expect to stick with your decision?” and “are you satisfied with your decision?” with responses ranging from Yes = 0, Unsure = 2, and No = 4 on a Likert scale.

Stress was measured using the Perceived Stress Scale (PSS-10) ($\alpha=.91$) [24]. Total scores range from 0 to 40, those scoring over 20 were considered “highly stressed”.

Depressive symptoms were measured using the Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9) [25] ($\alpha=.84$) as a continuous variable, and “depression” was defined using the standard cut point (≥ 11). The presence of suicidal ideation was assessed with question 9 (no vs. any).

Potential Moderators

Discrimination and stigma over the last 12 months were measured with the Discrimination and Stigma Scale (DISC-12) [26], comprised 32 questions, rated on a four-point Likert scale.

An overall score was generated using a binary score for each item, with higher values indicating greater experience of stigma and discrimination [27].

Bullying was measured with one question from the Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised (NAQ-R) ($\alpha=.90$), [28]: “Have you been bullied at work?” along with a definition, then coded into Yes=1, No=0.

Resilience was measured with the six-item Brief Resilience Scale (BRS) [29] ($\alpha=.86$), assessing the ability to bounce back or recover from stress. Those scoring over 15 were considered to have low resilience.

Sample Size

The sample size was based on the effect size in the CORAL study [18] which had a between-group effect size of hedge's $g = 0.69$ (95% CI 0.21 to 1.17, $p=0.005$) for mean difference in change in decisional conflict. A sample of 34 per arm would give 80% power to detect a smaller 0.4 effect size, allowing for a potential drop-out rate of 33% [30], the target sample size was 46 participants per condition.

Statistical Analysis

All data were analysed with SPSS version 24.0. Adequacy of randomisation was assessed by comparing baseline characteristics of the intervention and control groups using t-tests for continuous and Chi-squared for binary measures. Attrition was assessed comparing the post-intervention characteristics of the dropouts and the completers to determine any apparent differences.

Primary analyses were undertaken on an intention-to-treat basis, including all eligible participants randomised. Last Observation Carried Forward (LOCF) was used to handle the missing data, providing a conservative estimate of treatment effect if data are missing at random (MAR).

The main analysis of efficacy compared READY and the control on outcome measures at post-intervention and follow-up using between-subjects analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) with baseline scores as covariates. Cohen's d with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) was

calculated by comparing the change in means of READY and the control at each time point. According to Cohen, $d=0.2$ can be considered small, $d=0.5$ a medium effect and $d=0.8$ a large effect [31].

Univariate effects of the intervention and control and their interaction with baseline mental health and workplace factors were examined using between-subjects ANCOVAs adjusting for the relevant baseline variables (i.e., discrimination).

Univariate effects of the program groups and the interaction of severe mental disorders and common mental disorders on primary and secondary outcome measures were examined using between-subject ANOVAs.

Finally, the number of participants that disclosed (based on the SDM questionnaire) in each arm was reported along with any association with change in depression or stress scores at 6-week follow up.

Results

A total of 177 individuals completed online screening for eligibility. Of those, 56 (31.6%) were excluded, primarily because they had already disclosed their mental health condition in their workplace ($n=46$). A further 14 did not complete the baseline assessment, leaving 107 participants randomised. The study flow is illustrated in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Consort Flow of Participants.

The average age of the participants was 34.3 (SD=12.1) years. The sample was predominately female (83.2%), not married (61.7%), not of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander descent (97.2%). Many were employed in a social and community services industry (30.8%). The majority reported having a good relationship with their boss (71.0%) and colleagues (81.3%). One quarter had experienced discrimination when at work (27.1%), and 72% anticipated discrimination at work. Almost half (41.1%) had experienced bullying. Most participants had low resilience (61.7%), were depressed (≥ 11 on PHQ-9) (71.0%) and highly stressed (>20 on PSS-10) (84.1%) and had a diagnosed common mental health disorder

(74.8%) (Table 1). There were no baseline differences between the intervention and active control arms (Table 1).

There were no differences between the intervention and control in decisional conflict, decisional dissatisfaction, stage of decision making or stress scores at baseline although the intervention group had higher levels of depressive symptoms (Table 2).

Table 1. Baseline Characteristics overall and by Intervention type

Characteristics	All participants (n=107)	READY (n = 53)	Control (n=54)	difference between groups t-test or χ^2
Socio-demographic Characteristics				
Age, m (SD)	34.3 (12.1)	34.2 (11.7)	34.4 (12.6)	$p = 0.926$
Gender (Male), n (%)	18 (16.8)	10 (18.9)	8 (14.8)	$p = 0.533$
Married or de facto n (%)	41 (38.3)	22 (41.5)	19 (35.2)	$p = 0.547$
Aboriginal, n (%)	3 (2.8)	2 (3.8)	1 (1.9)	$p = 0.501$
Work Sector				
Social & community services, n (%)	33 (30.8)	15 (28.3)	18 (33.3)	$p = 0.527$
Service & manufacturing, n (%)	15 (14.0)	6 (11.3)	9 (16.7)	
Healthcare & emergency services, n (%)	19 (17.8)	7 (13.2)	12 (22.2)	
Economy, IT & trade, n (%)	16 (15.0)	10 (18.9)	6 (11.1)	
Hospitality, n (%)	10 (9.3)	7 (13.2)	3 (5.6)	
Other government agencies, n (%)	14 (13.1)	8 (15.1)	6 (11.1)	
Workplace Factors				
Good Relationship with boss, n (%)	76 (71.0)	35 (66.0)	41 (75.9)	$p = 0.260$
Good Relationship with colleagues, n (%)	87 (81.3)	45 (84.9)	42 (77.8)	$p = 0.344$
Experienced discrimination, (%)	29 (27.1)	14 (26.4)	15 (27.8)	$p = 0.874$
Anticipated discrimination, n (%)	77 (72.0)	41 (75.9)	36 (67.9)	$p = 0.357$
Experienced workplace bullying, n (%)	44 (41.1)	21 (39.6)	23 (42.6)	$p = 0.755$
Mental Health Scores				
Low Resilience, n (%)	66 (61.7)	31 (58.5)	35 (64.8)	$p = 0.554$
Depression, n (%)	76 (71.0)	40 (75.5)	36 (66.7)	$p = 0.395$
High Stress, n (%)	90 (84.1)	43 (81.1)	47 (87.0)	$p = 0.403$
Self-reported Diagnosis				
Common Mental Disorders	80 (74.8)	40 (75.5)	40 (74.1)	$p = 0.868$
Severe Mental Disorders	27 (25.2)	13 (24.5)	14 (25.9)	

Footnote: Severe mental disorder: schizophrenia, bipolar, psychosis. Common mental

disorder: – all other diagnoses

Overall, 24 (22.4%) of participants at post-intervention, and 62 (57.9%) at follow-up did not provide outcome data, with no differential attrition between the control group (post-intervention $n=42$, follow-up $n=20$) and READY (post-intervention $n=41$, follow-up $n=25$). Twenty-six participants completed the outcome data over the phone, 15 from the intervention group, and 11 from the control group, the remaining participants completing the self-assessment online. There was no association of any of the baseline characteristics with the completeness of data, supporting the MAR assumption for the LOCF analysis.

Of the 53 who started the READY program, 49 (92.5%) attempted at least one module, and 25 (47.2%) completed all seven modules. On average participants in the intervention group completed 3.9 (SD=3.2) modules. 51 (94.4%) of the control arm attempted at least one module, and 48 (88.9%) completed all of the four modules. On average, the control group completed 3.7 (SD=1.1) modules.

Primary Outcome – Decisional Conflict

Participants in the READY arm showed greater reduction in decisional conflict at post-intervention ($F(1,104) = 16.8$, $p = <.001$), which was sustained at follow up ($F(1,104) = 23.6$, $p = <.001$) compared to the control arm. Moderate between arm effect sizes were observed at post-intervention ($d=0.49$, CI=0.1-0.9) and at follow-up ($d=0.61$, CI=0.2-1.0) (Table 2, and Figure 2).

Table 2. Change in decision, stress and depression measures throughout the trial (ITT sample n=107)

Outcome	READY (n=53)	Control (n=54)	ANCOVA ^a F(1,104)	Cohen's <i>d</i> (95% CI)	<i>p</i> -value
	m (SD)	m (SD)			
Primary					
Decisional Conflict					
Baseline	59.1 (25.4)	67.6 (21.1)	-	-	0.061
Post-intervention	-28.9 (30.9)	-15.5 (23.6)	16.84	0.49 (0.10-0.87)	0.000**
Follow-up	-32.5 (30.8)	-15.7 (23.9)	23.59	0.61 (0.22-1.00)	0.000**
Secondary					
Decision Dissatisfaction					
Baseline	4.3 (1.5)	3.7 (2.1)	-	-	0.144
Post-intervention	0.0 (1.3)	0.4 (2.1)	0.40	0.23 (-0.15-0.61)	0.531
Follow-up	-2.1 (2.6)	0.0 (2.8)	7.52	0.78 (0.38-1.17)	0.008*
Stage of Decision Making					
Baseline	1.8 (0.8)	1.7 (0.7)	-	-	0.642
Post-intervention	0.7 (1.0)	0.3 (0.9)	6.88	0.42 (0.03-0.80)	0.010*
Follow-up	1.2 (1.3)	0.3 (0.9)	23.59	0.81 (0.41-1.20)	0.000**
Depression (PHQ-9)					
Baseline	16.4 (7.3)	13.6 (5.7)	-	-	0.034*
Post-intervention	-0.5 (4.3)	0.6 (2.9)	1.10	0.29 (-0.08-0.68)	0.297
Follow-up	-1.9 (5.0)	0.7 (3.6)	6.46	0.59 (0.21-0.98)	0.013*
Stress (PSS-10)					
Baseline	25.3 (6.6)	23.9 (5.0)	-	-	0.208
Post-intervention	-0.4 (2.8)	0.5 (1.9)	2.53	0.38 (-0.01-0.76)	0.115
Follow-up	-1.1 (3.9)	-0.1 (3.0)	1.34	0.29 (-0.09-0.67)	0.250

Footnote: measures are reported as LOCF=Last Observation Carried Forward, m=mean, SD=Standard Deviation, ANCOVA= Analysis of Covariance, a= controlling for baseline scores, ITT=Intention to Treat, PHQ-9=Patient Health Questionnaire-9, PSS-10=Perceived Stress Scale, *=<0.05, **=<0.001, Post-Intervention=immediately post intervention use, Follow-up=six-weeks post baseline.

Figure 2. Mean and standard errors in decisional conflict over the course of the trial

Secondary Outcomes

At post-intervention, the READY group were at a later stage of decision making than the control group ($F(1,104) = 6.9$, $p = 0.010$) with a moderate effect size of ($d = 0.42$, $CI = 0.3-0.8$).

This effect increased at follow-up ($F(1,104) = 23.6$, $p < .001$) with a large effect ($d = 0.81$, $CI = 0.4-1.2$). Decisional dissatisfaction was also reduced in the intervention arm (relative to control) at follow-up ($F(1,104) = 7.5$, $p = 0.008$) with a large effect ($d = 0.78$, $CI = 0.4-1.2$).

Depression (PHQ-9) scores were reduced in the intervention arm compared to the control

($F(1,104) = 6.5, p = 0.013$) with a moderate effect ($d = 0.59, CI = 0.2-1.0$) at follow-up, but not immediately post-intervention. There was no effect on stress (Table 2 and Sup Figure 1).

Supplementary Figure 1. Mean and standard errors in secondary outcome scores at all time points

There was greater decisional conflict at baseline in those who were highly stressed, those who had experienced bullying, had a bad relationship with their boss, or a bad relationship with their colleagues but this was not associated with depression, low resilience, anticipated or experienced discrimination at baseline. The comparative efficacy of READY was increased in those with low resilience (resilience X arm interaction) ($F(3,103) = 4.4, p = 0.038$).

There was no interaction between common or severe mental disorders and program arm efficacy on any outcome measures.

Impact of Using READY

Of the completers who provided follow-up data ($n = 25$ intervention and $n = 20$ in control figure 1), seven (28%) of the READY group disclosed their condition and none in the control arm. As disclosure was only seen in those who used READY the results below only consider the intervention group. Disclosure was associated with a greater reduction in both depression and stress than non-disclosure (Table 3).

Table 3. Change in Depression and Stress scores at follow-up in disclosed vs. non-disclosed in those who used READY

Outcome	Disclosed (n=7)	Non- disclosure (n=18)	Mean Difference	
	m (SD)	m (SD)	m (95% CI)	p-value
Baseline				
Depression (PHQ-9)	19.3 (5.6)	15.2 (8.1)	4.1 (-2.8 – 11.0)	0.231
Stress (PSS-10)	26.4 (4.4)	24.3 (7.2)	2.2 (-3.9 – 8.2)	0.469
Follow-up Change				
Depression (PHQ-9)	-8.5 (5.4)	-3.5 (2.3)	5.0 (0.5 – 9.5)	0.034*
Stress (PSS-10)	-9.8 (3.3)	-3.2 (2.2)	6.6 (2.6 – 10.6)	0.006*

Footnote: m=mean, SD=Standard Deviation, PHQ-9=Patient Health Questionnaire-9, PSS-10=Perceived Stress Scale, *= <0.05 , Follow-up=six-weeks post baseline.

DISCUSSION

This trial demonstrated that READY, the first online decision aid tool for employees, significantly reduced decisional conflict regarding disclosure of a mental health condition compared to a provision of standard information and that this was sustained at follow up. Use of the program resulted in people being at a later stage of decision making, being more satisfied with their decision and less depressed at follow up, indicating no psychological harm. These results are consistent with previous research on the effectiveness of providing decision aid tools for health-related decisions [32].

The efficacy of READY was unaffected by whether participants had a common or severe mental disorder. This finding is interesting, given that those with severe mental illness' often have additional factors to consider such as higher rates of unemployment, underemployment, poorer vocational outcomes and negative societal stereotypes [33, 34] suggesting that disclosure decision-making options may be more difficult.

Although the tool was not developed to lead to one particular decision, be it disclosure or not, one-quarter of those using READY who completed follow-up measures decided to disclose, whereas none of those in the control arm did. Of those who disclosed, 86% reported satisfaction with this decision. While READY facilitated the disclosure decision, seemingly low rates of actual disclosure were reported. We have no idea of what the optimum disclosure rate is given all of the known barriers and we observed no disclosure in the control arm. This suggests that a decision aid tool may facilitate the decision, but cannot address all barriers to disclosure, such as workplace support or culture. The low rates may also have been due to the short follow-up period of six weeks. We might have seen a higher rate of disclosure if participants had adequate time to meet with their managers to disclose formally.

There was a significant reduction in depression and stress in those who disclosed compared to those who didn't. Although only seen in a small sample, this suggests two possible inferences. First, deciding to disclose might reduce depression and stress symptoms in employees, and accords with a recent Australian survey that showed that receiving support when disclosing is more common than expected [35]. Second, participants who recovered

from their depression then decided to disclose. The latter may be less likely as the disclosure has been reported as more common when individuals are experiencing greater symptoms [36, 37] or when there is a need [16], and less common when they display fewer symptoms [38].

The level of resilience influenced the impact of READY on decisional conflict, suggesting that those who have low resilience may benefit the most from a structured online decision aid tool.

Surprisingly, discrimination was not associated with higher decisional conflict scores at entry, nor did they induce differential decreases in decisional conflict, contradicting previous research from CORAL [18].

Strengths and limitations

This study had several strengths. The online decision aid tool was co-created with experts and end users and compared with an active control. Being a completely online intervention, READY maximises confidentiality which was previously reported as a barrier to disclosure [12]. The literacy requirements of the tool were set at an appropriate level as some disclosure information is legalistic and requires high levels of literacy. For instance, the information provided from the NGO's website in the control arm had a reading age of 17.7 years, this may have enhanced the comparative efficacy of READY [39].

This study had some limitations. Although attrition was low for an internet-delivered intervention [30], we used a conservative analytic method (LOCF) that likely underestimated any effects. Women and those working in social and community services were over-represented, potentially limiting generalisability of the results. However, not surprising as higher participation and interest from women is not uncommon when help-seeking for mental health conditions [40]. Lastly, the lead researcher conducted reminder phone calls to participants, possibly affected blinding, although randomisation arm was not visible.

Implications and future directions

READY reduced decisional conflict and facilitated decision making among employees. There was no indication that the tool led to harm. Future studies should evaluate the long-term

effectiveness, and potential adaptation for culturally and linguistically diverse workplaces, in younger working adults and male-dominated workplaces.

Funding

This study was developed in partnership with *beyondblue* with donations from the Movember Foundation.

Declaration of Interests

ES, NG, SBH, RAC & IC all received funding by *beyondblue* and Movember Foundation via a grant to run this study. CH & IH have none.

Author Contribution

ES, NG, CH & SBH contributed the conception and design of the work. ES, IC & NG completed the analyses and interpretation of the data and initial draft of this work. All authors revised the work critically, added to the interpretation of the data and added important intellectual content and reviewed the final draft.

REFERENCES

1. Lassman, F., et al., *How does a decision aid help people decide whether to disclose a mental health problem to employers? Qualitative interview study*. J Occup Rehabil, 2015. **25**(2): p. 403-11.
2. Ellison, M.L., Russinova, Z., MacDonald-Wilson, K.L., and Lyass, A. , *Patterns and correlates of workplace disclosure among professionals and managers with psychiatric conditions*. Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation 2003. **18**: p. 3-13.
3. Wheat, K., et al., *Mental illness and the workplace: conceal or reveal?* J R Soc Med, 2010. **103**(3): p. 83-6.
4. Reavley, N.J., A.J. Morgan, and A.F. Jorm, *Predictors of experiences of discrimination and positive treatment in people with mental health problems: findings from an Australian national survey*. Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol, 2017. **52**(3): p. 269-277.
5. Brohan, E., et al., *Employees with mental health problems: Survey of U.K. employers' knowledge, attitudes and workplace practices*. Epidemiol Psychiatr Soc, 2010. **19**(4): p. 326-32.
6. Brohan, E., et al., *Systematic review of beliefs, behaviours and influencing factors associated with disclosure of a mental health problem in the workplace*. BMC Psychiatry, 2012. **12**: p. 11.
7. Peterson, D., N. Currey, and S. Collings, *"You don't look like one of them": disclosure of mental illness in the workplace as an ongoing dilemma*. Psychiatr Rehabil J, 2011. **35**(2): p. 145-7.
8. Corrigan, P.W., B.G. Druss, and D.A. Perlick, *The Impact of Mental Illness Stigma on Seeking and Participating in Mental Health Care*. Psychol Sci Public Interest, 2014. **15**(2): p. 37-70.
9. Glozier, N., *Workplace effects of the stigmatization of depression*. J Occup Environ Med, 1998. **40**(9): p. 793-800.
10. Reavley, N.J., A.F. Jorm, and A.J. Morgan, *Discrimination and positive treatment toward people with mental health problems in workplace and education settings: Findings from an Australian National Survey*. Stigma and Health, 2017. **2**(4): p. 254-265.
11. Evans-Lacko, S. and M. Knapp, *Global patterns of workplace productivity for people with depression: absenteeism and presenteeism costs across eight diverse countries*. Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology, 2016. **51**(11): p. 1525-1537.
12. Stratton, E., et al., *Deciding to Disclose a Mental Health Condition in Male Dominated Workplaces; A Focus-Group Study*. Frontiers in Psychiatry, 2018. **9**(684).
13. Irvine, A., *Something to declare? The disclosure of common mental health problems at work*. Disability and Society, 2011. **26**(2): p. 179-192.
14. Corrigan, P.W.M., A.K. , *Stigma and disclosure: Implications for coming out of the closet*. . Journal of Mental Health, 2003. **12**(3): p. 235-248.
15. Pachankis, J.E., *The psychological implications of concealing a stigma: a cognitive-affective-behavioral model*. Psychol Bull, 2007. **133**(2): p. 328-45.
16. Toth, K.E. and C.S. Dewa, *Employee decision-making about disclosure of a mental disorder at work*. J Occup Rehabil, 2014. **24**(4): p. 732-46.
17. Stacey, D., et al., *Decision aids for people facing health treatment or screening decisions*. Cochrane Database Syst Rev, 2017. **4**: p. CD001431.
18. Henderson, C., et al., *Decision aid on disclosure of mental health status to an employer: feasibility and outcomes of a randomised controlled trial*. Br J Psychiatry, 2013. **203**(5): p. 350-7.
19. Kincaid, P.J., Fishburne, R.P., Rogers, R.L., and Chissom, B.S., *"Derivation Of New Readability Formulas (Automated Readability Index, Fog Count And Flesch Reading*

- Ease Formula) For Navy Enlisted Personnel"* 1975, Institute for Simulation and Training: Memphis, Tenn: Naval Air Station.
20. Memish, K., et al., *Workplace mental health: An international review of guidelines*. Prev Med, 2017. **101**: p. 213-222.
 21. Harman, G., and Heath, J. , *Australian Country Perspective: The Work of beyondblue and SANE Australia*. In: Gaebel W., Rössler W., Sartorius N. (eds) *The Stigma of Mental Illness - End of the Story?*. 2016, Springer, Cham.
 22. O'Connor, A.M., *Validation of a decisional conflict scale*. Med Decis Making, 1995. **15**(1): p. 25-30.
 23. O'Connor, A.M., et al., *Decision aids for people facing health treatment or screening decisions*. Cochrane Database Syst Rev, 2001(3): p. CD001431.
 24. Cohen, S., T. Kamarck, and R. Mermelstein, *A global measure of perceived stress*. J Health Soc Behav, 1983. **24**(4): p. 385-96.
 25. Kroenke, K., R.L. Spitzer, and J.B. Williams, *The PHQ-9: validity of a brief depression severity measure*. J Gen Intern Med, 2001. **16**(9): p. 606-13.
 26. Thornicroft, G., et al., *Global pattern of experienced and anticipated discrimination against people with schizophrenia: a cross-sectional survey*. Lancet, 2009. **373**(9661): p. 408-15.
 27. Henderson, C., et al., *England's time to change antistigma campaign: one-year outcomes of service user-rated experiences of discrimination*. Psychiatr Serv, 2012. **63**(5): p. 451-7.
 28. Einarsen, S., H. Hoel, and G. Notelaers, *Measuring exposure to bullying and harassment at work: Validity, factor structure and psychometric properties of the Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised*. Vol. 23. 2009. 24-44.
 29. Smith, B.W., et al., *The brief resilience scale: assessing the ability to bounce back*. Int J Behav Med, 2008. **15**(3): p. 194-200.
 30. Christensen, H., K.M. Griffiths, and L. Farrer, *Adherence in internet interventions for anxiety and depression*. J Med Internet Res, 2009. **11**(2): p. e13.
 31. Cohen, J., *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*, ed. Routledge. 1977.
 32. Stacey, D., et al., *Decision aids for people facing health treatment or screening decisions*. Cochrane Database Syst Rev, 2011(10): p. CD001431.
 33. Ellison, M.L., et al., *Professionals and Managers With Severe Mental Illnesses: Findings From a National Survey*. The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 2008. **196**(3): p. 179-189.
 34. Corrigan, P.W. and D. Rao, *On the self-stigma of mental illness: stages, disclosure, and strategies for change*. Canadian journal of psychiatry. Revue canadienne de psychiatrie, 2012. **57**(8): p. 464-469.
 35. Reavley, N.J., A.J. Morgan, and A.F. Jorm, *Disclosure of mental health problems: findings from an Australian national survey*. Epidemiol Psychiatr Sci, 2018. **27**(4): p. 346-356.
 36. Cukrowicz, K.C., et al., *What factors determine disclosure of suicide ideation in adults 60 and older to a treatment provider?* Suicide Life Threat Behav, 2014. **44**(3): p. 331-7.
 37. Fulginiti, A., et al., *What Factors Influence the Decision to Share Suicidal Thoughts? A Multilevel Social Network Analysis of Disclosure Among Individuals with Serious Mental Illness*. Suicide Life Threat Behav, 2016. **46**(4): p. 398-412.
 38. Banks BR, N.J., Mank DM, Grossi T., *Disclosure of a psychiatric disability in supported employment: an exploratory study*. Intl J Psychosocial Rehabil, 2007. **11**: p. 69-84.
 39. Ennis, L. and T. Wykes, *Sense and readability: participant information sheets for research studies*. Br J Psychiatry, 2016. **208**(2): p. 189-94.

40. Seidler, Z.E., et al., *The role of masculinity in men's help-seeking for depression: A systematic review*. Clin Psychol Rev, 2016. **49**: p. 106-118.